



CONSUMER GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL FORUM
Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam
Shakti Bhawan, IInd Floor, Room No.317, Sector-6, Panchkula
E-mail: uhbv_forum2006@yahoo.com
Fax & Phone No. 0172-2583896

Complaint No. CGRF-521/11

To

The Managing Director,
UHBVN, Panchkula.


Memo No. Ch- 40 /UH/CGRF-521

Dated: 30/12/2011

Subject: - Order in respect of complaint of Sh. Sanjay Gupta regarding wrong notice of amounting to Rs. 15848/- sent by SDO East, Ambala.

Enclosed please find herewith the order issued by Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum in respect of above complaint for its compliance.

DA/As above


Secretary,
CGRF, UHBVN,
Panchkula

CC.

1. Secretary/HERC, Sec-4, Panchkula.
2. CE/OP, UHBVN, Panchkula.
3. SE/ 'OP' Circle UHBVN, Ambala.
4. XEN/IT, UHBVN, Panchkula. (for posting on UHBVN site)
5. XEN/OP City Division, UHBVN, Ambala with a copy of order.
6. SDO/OP, City S/Division, East, UHBVN, Ambala.
7. Sh. Sanjay Gupta, M/s Jay Vee Rice & General Mills, R/o H. No. 420, Sector-9, Urban Estate, Ambala City.

For information & further necessary action with respect to order of Forum (copy enclosed).



CONSUMER GRIEVANCES REDRESSAL FORUM

Uttar Haryana Bijli Vitran Nigam

Room No.317, IIInd Floor, Shakti Bhawan, Sector-6, Panchkula

E-mail: uhbvn_forum2006@yahoo.com

| | |
|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Complaint No. | UH/CGRF - 521 of 2011 |
| Date of Institution | 30.08.2011 |
| Date of Hearing | 29.11.2011 |
| Date of Order | 07.12.2011 |

Before the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum, UHBVNL.

Present:-

1. Sh. R.K. Jain, Member-I.
2. Sh. D.C. Aggarwal, Member-II.
3. Sh. Raj Roop-Jakhar, Member-III.

In the matter of complaint of Sh. Sanjay Gupta C/o M/s Jay Veer Rice & General Mills, Sullar Road, Ambala City regarding billing problem

.....Complainant/Petitioner

Vs

- (1) XEN, City Division, UHBVN, Ambala City.
- (2) SDO, OP East Sub-Division, UHBVN, Ambala City.

.....Respondents

Appearance:-

For Complainant:

None

For the Respondent:

Sh. Lalit Attrey SDO, OP East Sub-Division, UHBVN, Ambala City





The complainant Sh. Sanjay Gupta C/o M/s Jay Veer Rice & General Mills, Sullar Road, Ambala City has got two electric connections bearing A/c No. LS-29, and LS- 34 under East Sub-Division, UHBVN, Ambala City and the Forum have the jurisdiction to try this complaint.

It has been pleaded by the complainant that on 24.8.11 SDO East Sub-Division issued a notice to him to deposit Rs. 15848/- within 7 days without giving any details, being the amount raised by the Audit Party against PLEC / MMC / ETC / Fixed charges. He has contested that this amount is not chargeable. It is the fault of the dept that they do not work as per Circulars. When the audit party raises and the amount pointed out is even wrongly charged by the office, why audit party does not point out that the interest is payable on security deposited by the consumers years which the dept does not give. In his case Rs. 42991/- (LS- 29 = Rs. 290481/- and LS-34 = Rs. 22510/-) is standing refundable to him for the last five months which has not been refunded. The connection LS- 34 is his second unit in Ambala City. Rs. 15848/- charged is also illegal because this is the fault of SDO because they do not work as per Circular. He has pleaded before the Forum that directions may be issued for giving him justice.

The application of the petitioner was received in this office of the Forum on 29.8.11. The Forum considered the facts and found the petition feasible of acceptance and the same was admitted. Accordingly, notice of motion dated 1.9.11 was issued to both the parties asking complainant to submit affidavit and asking respondent to submit version. Further notice of motion dated 4.10.11 was issued asking the respondents to submit version.

The respondent submitted the version vide memo No- 1204 / CA dt. 3.10.11 stating enclosing the details of the calculations of Rs. 15848/- and enclosing SC No- U-3/2011, U-28/2010 and stating that amount was pointed out by the Audit vide HM No- 168 dt 18.7.11 . However the respondent SDO did not explain anything in writing.

Summon were issued to both the parties for hearing on 12.10.11, 24.10.11, 9.11.11, 16.11.11 and 29.11.11. During proceedings held on 12.10.11 the respondent was directed to bring comprehensive details / reply on the point in the complaint and get the same verified from the RA. In reply dated 21.10.11 the respondent SDO confirmed

Am

Amo

[Handwritten signature]



the credit standing in the two accounts of the complainant, and stated that there is no provision in UHBVN for giving any interest on such credits. It was admitted by the respondent that some amount was refundable but the same would require approval of Chief Auditor. Chief Auditor was therefore, asked vide memo No- Ch-22/CGRF-521/UH dt. 2.11.2011, to submit reply wrt the complaint and attend the hearing on 9.11.11. Chief Auditor vide his memo No- CA/RA/IAR-323/Ch63 replied that after the amount was pointed out the same has been charged by the sub-division, if the SDO feels that any amount was refundable, he should pursue the matter with his office through XEn for refund. During proceedings held on 16.11.11 it was pointed out that the Half Margin was wrong and it was responsibility of the Chief Auditor also to look into the same instead of passing the responsibility on the Sub-Division simply because the later had charged the amount. It was agreed that sub-division shall submit the case to the Chief Auditor and the final report shall be submitted to the Forum latest by 25.11.11. Chief Auditor was also directed to appear before the Forum in person on 29.11.11 and on this date the respondent SDO submitted in writing that refund of Rs. 4250/- had been allowed to the consumer vide SC&AR item No- 4/95 dt 28.11.11 against the a/c No- LS-29. The Chief Auditor also vide memo No- CA/RA/IAR-323/Ch-65 dated 28.11.11 confirmed concurrence of accuracy of this amount as refundable.

The Forum considered the facts and observed that the respondent SDO and Chief Auditor had allowed the due refund to the complainant both on a/c of billing and PLEC so the grievance of the consumer had been redressed. The respondent SDO shall supply necessary details to the complainant.

The petition is hereby disposed of without any cost on either side. File be consigned to the office record.

The Order is signed by the Consumer Grievances Redressal Forum on 7.12.2011.


(Raj Roop Jakhar)
Member-III


(D.C. Aggarwal)
Member-II


(R.K. Jain)
Member-I

